

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/918,702	BENVENISTY, NISSIM	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Deborah Crouch, Ph.D.	1632	

**All Participants:**

(1) Deborah Crouch, Ph.D.

(2) Barbara Carter.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Joe Weitach.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** June 1, 2005

**Time:** 11:00

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
*Obviousness*

Claims discussed:  
*of record*


Prior art documents discussed:  
*of record*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: I suggested that applicant amend the claims to methods of directed differentiation to produce neuronal cells for allowance, with the limitation of chemically dissociating the stem cells. This will overcome the art rejection and not raise new issues.. Ms Carter will discuss this with her client. .